

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

Request for Priority

Applicant claimed priority to Application No. 091138155, filed in Taiwan R.O.C. on December 31, 2002, by way of indicating such on an Application Data Sheet (ADS) on December 17, 2003 and submission of a certified priority document on March 29, 2005. Applicant notes that this claim of priority has not yet been acknowledged by the Examiner in full. Specifically, box 12(a)(1) was not checked on the PTOL-326 form of the Office Action mailed September 26, 2008. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide acknowledgement of said claim of priority.

Examiner interview

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative during the personal interview conducted on December 29, 2008.

During the interview, Applicant's representative point out that, while plural non-parallel coil windings are provided in the presently claimed invention to power an implantable device, the cited references (Seligman and Paul) disclose only a single coil serving to power a device. Other coils provided by both Seligman and Paul function to receive data (Seligman) or to detect noise (Paul) but not to provide power.

It was agreed that Seligman and Paul do not disclose multiple coil windings providing power. It was further agreed that an amendment to claim 1 to replace the words "for operation of" with the words "to power" to clarify that the coil windings are provided "to power" the control circuit would overcome the present rejection.

Claim objections

Claim 1 is presently objected to for certain informalities. In particular, the Examiner note that, in the last line of claim 1, the word “and” should be removed. Applicant notes that the word “and” in the last line of claim 1 was indicated to be deleted by strike-through in the previous amendment, and is not found in the presently amended claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 7, 12, and 14 presently stand rejected as being anticipated by Seligman (U.S. 5,991,958). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, from which all of claims 2-14 depend, sets forth a wireless transceiver for providing a power supply for operation of an implantable device. More particularly, claim 1 recites that ***both first and second coil windings*** are electrically connected to the control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power to the control circuit ***to power*** the control circuit in response to the signal.

Moreover, the second coil is wound around its coil axis in a direction non-parallel with the direction of the first coil.

Seligman fails to anticipate the present invention because *Seligman* does not disclose or suggest first and second coil windings both electrically connected to a control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power to a control circuit ***to power the control circuit***.

Seligman discloses only a single coil powering a circuit. More particularly, *Seligman* discloses that an “external inductor 13 and an internal inductor 23 include respective ferrite cores 10, 20; a data winding 11, 21; and a power winding 12, 22. Thus, each inductor includes ***a coil specifically for data transfer***, and an ***orthogonally wound coil for power transfer***.” (*Seligman*; col. 4, lines 6-10; emphasis added).

Thus, *Seligman* teaches, within the implanted device, a ***single coil*** (winding 22) for power transfer, and another coil 21 for data transfer, not for powering a circuit.

Seligman therefore does not disclose or suggest both a first and second coil winding configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power to a control circuit ***to power the control circuit*** in response to the signal.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all of claims 1-14 are all allowable over *Seligman*, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejection of claims 5, 6, 8-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 6, 8-11 and 13 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Seligman* in view of *Paul et al.* (U.S. 5,697,958). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicant notes that claims 5, 6, 8-11 and 13 each depend from claim 1. As discussed above, *Seligman* fails to disclose or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 1, since *Seligman* does not disclose or suggest both first and second coil windings both electrically connected to a control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to and to supply electrical power to a control circuit ***to power the control circuit***.

It is respectfully submitted that *Paul* also fails to disclose or suggest both first and second coil windings both electrically connected to a control circuit and configured to receive a signal from an external source and to supply electrical power to the control circuit ***to power the control circuit***.

Paul, in fact, does not include any teaching or suggestion of any coil winding that is electrically connected to a control circuit and configured to ***power the control circuit***.

Paul discloses telemetry circuitry and noise detection circuitry. While in one embodiment *Paul* discloses "a three-dimensional coil antenna system for use in a ***noise detector*** according to the present invention" (*Paul*; col. 14, lines 35-37), *Paul* never discloses or suggests any power-supplying function of this noise detector and *Paul* never discloses or suggests plural (first and at least one second) coil windings configured ***to power*** a control circuit.

Therefore, *Seligman* and *Paul*, whether considered individually or in any combination, fail to form a prima facie case of obviousness of claim 1 since neither of these references discloses or suggests each and every element of claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 6, 8-11 and 13 are allowable over these cited references at least due to their dependency from claim 1, and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-14 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: January 13, 2009

Respectfully submitted,


JOHN R. SCHAEFER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,921